UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,353	01/26/2005	Ian M Robertson	555255012830	1392

89441   7590   05/06/2010

Jones Day (RIM) - 2N
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER
NICKERSON, JEFFREY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/06/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dlpejeau@jonesday.com
portfolioprosecution@rim.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/522,353	ROBERTSON, IAN M
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEFFREY NICKERSON	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 January 2010</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Application No. 10/522,353 filed nationally

on 26 January 2005 and internationally on 29 July 2003. The request for continued

examination presented on 19 October 2009, which amends claims 1, 3, and 39, and

presents arguments, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-49 are currently pending and

have been examined.

35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Rejections

3.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 3, this claim recites "wherein the received message comprises an

attachment that is common to a previously received attachment..". The examiner

believes this phrase should read "wherein the outgoing message comprises an

attachment that is common to a previously received attachment" and will treat it as such

for purposes of further examination.

35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim Rejections

5.   Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1, this claim is directed towards a method for mimetic message setting. While the claim recites a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine in such a way to impose a meaningful limit and involve more than insignificant extra-solution activity, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. The claimed method including steps of detecting, determining, and selecting, and is broad enough that the claim could be performed completely mentally, verbally and/or physically by a human, and therefore without any particular machine. Furthermore, no transformation is apparent. Regarding the claim being performed mentally, verbally, and/or physically by a human, for example: the messaging client could be a human and the messages could be verbal or handwritten communication, while the steps being

performed completely mentally. Adding language describing structural interrelationships to be at least "a particular machine" that enables the functionality of the method to be realized may overcome this rejection.

Regarding claims 2-38 and 49, these claims fail to cure the deficiencies of their parent claim(s) and thus encompass the non-statutory subject matter and inherit the rejection.

With specific regard to claims 34-35, these claims inherently require the messages to be electronic messages. However, even when such is the case, all steps of the method could still be performed mentally by a human (Am I creating an email?; I am, and I see quoted text in it, this must be a reply; Was the originating message encrypted?; It was, I should encrypt mine). Thus the method is not tied to a particular machine and encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

With specific regard to claims 36-37, these claims require the messaging client to be on a computing device. However, a recitation that a method of selection on a client operating on a device in the preamble of the claim does not significantly tie the method to a machine. The client could still be interpreted as a human, which is operating on a device, while mentally performing the steps of the method. Thus the method is not tied to a particular machine and encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 39, this claim is directed to a "system" containing "a message store", and "a messaging client". No recitation of required structure has been identified within the claim language and, therefore, the claim may be directed entirely to software or a human. As such, the claim is directed to non- statutory subject matter. Explicitly reciting structure that allows the functionally descriptive components to be realized may overcome this rejection.

Regarding claims 40-48, these claims fail to cure the deficiencies of their parent claim(s) and thus encompass the non-statutory subject matter and inherit the rejection.

With specific regard to claim 47, this claim requires that the "system is implemented in a device". This does not require structure within the system itself and thus does not cure the deficiencies of the parent. For instance, if the system is considered as a human, and the human then walks into a spacecraft, then the human would be in a data communication device, and thus the system would be implemented in the device. However, the system would still be just a human and thus non-statutory subject matter.

35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) have

been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections

8.   Claims 1-8, 21-27, 33-34, 36-37, and 39-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); and in further view of

Klein (US 6,496,853 B1), and Baldonado (US 7,035,903 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Ramsdell teaches a method of mimetic settings selection on a

messaging client (sending agent), comprising the steps of:

        detecting an outgoing message (Ramsdell: pg 9, lines 22-23 specify the sending

agent recognizing it is sending a message);

        determining whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received

message, the received message having message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 10,

lines 28-40 specify that if encryption capabilities aren't readily known that it should try to

find a recently received message from that recipient, the recently received message

having being encrypted);

        wherein said determining whether the outgoing message is related to the

previously received message is based upon the outgoing message and the previously

received message having a characteristic in common or comprising a message thread
(Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40);

determining messaging settings (encryption algorithm) associated with the
message characteristics (encryption) of the received message where the outgoing
message is related to a previously received message (Ramsdell: pg 10, 28-40 specify
that if a related message is found its encryption algorithm should be used); and

selecting the messaging settings (encryption algorithm) with the message
characteristics (encryption) of the received message to control message characteristics
(encryption) of the outgoing message (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 specify that the
encryption algorithm of the related message be used on the outgoing message);

wherein the message characteristics of the outgoing message are controlled
based on the outgoing message being related to a previously-received message
(Ramsdell: pg 10, section 2.7.1.2 Rule 2 provides for using encryption of most recent
previously received encrypted message from recipient).

Ramdell does not teach wherein the characteristic for determining messages are
related is the contents of the messages; or

wherein an outgoing message is related to a previously-received message based
on the content of the outgoing message.

Klein, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the characteristic for
determining messages are related is the contents of the messages (Klein: Figure 7; col
11, lines 27-52); and

wherein a first message is related to a previously-received message based on the content of the first message (Klein: Figure 7; col 11, lines 27-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Klein for identifying related messages based on message contents. The teachings of Klein, when implemented in the Ramsdell system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to identify related messages based on a multitude of criteria. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Klein in the Ramsdell system in order to more efficiently and effectively identify related messages based on various criteria consisting of more than just the recipient information.

The Ramsdell/Klein system does not teach wherein the first message is an outgoing message.

Baldonado, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the first message is an outgoing message (Baldonado: abstract; Figure 4, step S120; col 4, lines 56 – col 5, line 2; col 5, lines 36-61; col 6, lines 8-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Baldonado for identifying related messages for an outgoing message. The teachings of Baldonado, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to identify related messages for outgoing messages based on multiple criteria. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Baldonado in the Ramsdell/Klein

system in order to allow users to be made aware of related messages while they are

constructing a new outgoing one.

Regarding claim 2, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of

determining whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message

comprises the step of determining whether the outgoing message includes a portion of

the previously received message (Klein: col 11, line 43-52 specify using message

contents to identify related messages; See also Figure 7; See also col 11, lines 27-38).

Regarding claim 3, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the outgoing

message comprises an attachment that is common to a previously received attachment

received with the previously received message (Baldonado: col 4, line 56 – col 5, line 2

provides for outgoing emails; Klein: col 9, lines 6-9 provide that the message

contents/subject matter may be attachments); and

      wherein the step of determining whether the outgoing message includes a

portion of a previously received message comprises the step of determining whether the

outgoing message includes the attachment that is common to the previously received

attachment (Baldonado: col 4, line 56 – col 5, line 2 provides that subject matter of the

outgoing email may be used to identify related messages via a keyword search; Klein:

col 11, lines 43-52 specify using message contents/subject matter to identify related

messages; See also Figure 7; col 9, lines 6-9 specify that "message contents" include

attached documents).

Regarding claim 4, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of determining whether the outgoing message is related to a previously received message comprises the step of determining whether the outgoing message is a reply to a previously received message (Klein: col 1, lines 33-38).

Regarding claim 5, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of determining the outgoing message is related to a previously received message comprises the step of determining whether the outgoing message is a forward message incorporating a previously received message (Klein: col 1, lines 33-38).

Regarding claim 6, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of determining messaging settings (signature algorithm/encryption algorithm) comprises the steps of:

analyzing the received message to determine the message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 33-36 specify the previously received message is analyzed to determine the encryption);

determining messaging settings (encryption algorithm) that control the message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 37-40 specify using the received message's encryption to determine the encryption algorithm for the outgoing message).

Regarding claim 7, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the message characteristics are specified in the received message, (Ramsdell: pg 20, lines 20-21 specify there is a field that contains the signature information) and wherein the step of determining message settings comprises the steps of:

accessing the specified message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 23, lines 21-43 specify that the header can contain signature information; pg 10, lines 28-40 specify that the encryption algorithm of a received message would only be used if it is both encrypted and signed, therefore the signature would have to be checked);

and determining messaging settings that control the specified message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 specify determining the outgoing message encryption).

Regarding claim 8, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the received message (MIME entity) comprises a messaging settings field (header) specifying messaging settings (the signature information) used for the received message, (Ramsdell: pg 20, lines 20-21 specify there is a field that contains the signature information)

and wherein the step of determining messaging settings (outgoing encryption algorithm) comprises the step of accessing the messaging settings field in the received message (Ramsdell: pg 23, lines 21-43 specify that the header can contain signature information; pg 10, lines 28-40 specify that the encryption algorithm of a received

message would only be used if it is both encrypted and signed, therefore the signature would have to be checked, possibly via accessing the header).

Regarding claim 21, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the message characteristics (both digital signature and encryption) of the received message comprise a message characteristic associated with a plurality of messaging settings (both encryption algorithm and signature algorithm), and wherein the step of selecting the messaging settings comprises the step of selecting one of the plurality of messaging settings (Ramsdell: pg 6, lines 18-21 indicate there is more than one type of signature and encryption algorithms that could be associated with a received message; pg 27, line 43 – pg 28, line 22 specify a handful of different encryption and signature algorithms; pg 10, lines 37-40 specify one of the algorithms is chosen for the outgoing message).

Regarding claim 22, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the steps of determining messaging settings and selecting the messaging settings are repeated for each received message to which the outgoing message is related (Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that if an outgoing message is addressed to multiple recipients, the multiple previously received messages may be analyzed to determine an encryption algorithm for each recipient).

Regarding claim 23, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the outgoing message is related to a first received message having first message

characteristics and a second received message having second message characteristics

(Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that an outgoing message could be addressed to

multiple recipients with different encryption algorithms; pg 10, lines 28-40 specify the

encryption determination can be done on previously received messages), and wherein

the step of selecting the messaging settings associated with the message

characteristics of the received message further comprises the steps of:

determining whether the first and second message characteristics (encryption)

include conflicting messaging characteristics; (Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify the

ability to identify if encryption algorithms don't overlap, and therefore conflict)

selecting the messaging settings (encryption) associated with the first and

second message characteristics where the first and second message characteristics do

not include conflicting messaging settings (Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that if

the encryption algorithms of the intended recipients don't overlap, the sending agent

must then use multiple sending encryption algorithms. This provides that if the

encryption algorithms do overlap, and therefore do not conflict, then it would not need to

use multiple sending encryption algorithms and therefore encrypt the message with the

overlapping encryption algorithm).

Regarding claim 24, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

outgoing message is related to a first received message having first message

characteristics and a second received message having second message characteristics

(Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that an outgoing message could be addressed to

multiple recipients with different encryption algorithms; pg 10, lines 28-40 specify the
encryption determination can be done on previously received messages), and wherein
the step of selecting the messaging settings associated with the message
characteristics of the received message further comprises the steps of:

determining whether messaging settings (encryption capabilities) associated with
the first and second message characteristics include conflicting messaging settings;
(Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify the ability to identify if encryption algorithms don't
overlap, and therefore conflict)

selecting the messaging settings (encryption) associated with the first and
second message characteristics where the messaging settings associated with the first
and second message characteristics do not include conflicting messaging settings
(Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that if the encryption algorithms of the intended
recipients don't overlap, the sending agent must then use multiple sending encryption
algorithms).

Regarding claim 25, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of
selecting the messaging settings associated with the message characteristics of the
received message further comprises the step of:

resolving conflicting messaging characteristics where the first and second
message characteristics include conflicting message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 11,
lines 23-33 specify that if the encryption capabilities conflict, then two separate
message could be sent with the differing encryption algorithms).

Regarding claim 26, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of

selecting the messaging settings associated with the message characteristics of the

received message further comprises the step of:

resolving conflicting messaging settings where the messaging settings

associated with the first and second message characteristics include the messaging

settings (Ramsdell: pg 11, lines 23-33 specify that if the encryption capabilities conflict,

then two separate message could be sent with the differing encryption algorithms).

Regarding claim 27, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the step of

resolving the conflicting messaging settings comprises selecting most secure

messaging settings among the conflicting messaging settings (Ramsdell: pg 11, lines

23-33 specify that the message should only be sent with the strongest algorithm

because it could easily be intercepted and broken if a second copy is sent with a

weaker algorithm).

Regarding claim 33, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

message characteristics of the received message comprise one or more characteristics

selected from the group consisting of:

message format, message font, common message text, message signing

(signatures), and message encryption (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 specify the

received encrypted message will be checked for a trusted signature, covering both signatures and encryption characteristics).

Regarding claim 34, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the message signing and the message encryption are signing and encryption according to Secure Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (Ramsdell: Pg 1, lines 21-27 specify the security throughout the publication is about S/MIME encryption and signatures).

Regarding claim 36, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the messaging client operates on a wireless mobile communication device (Klein: Figure 1; col 4, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 37, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the messaging client operates on a personal computer (Klein: Figure 1).

Regarding claim 39, this system claim comprises limitations found within claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable, and wherein the system contains a message store configured to store messages having message characteristics (Ramsdell: pg 10, 28-40 specify the past received messages are analyzed for past used encryption techniques, indicating that the messages are stored, along with their characteristics; See also pg 8, lines 24-26).

Regarding claim 40, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

message store is configured to store messages received by the messaging client and

messages sent (pending to be sent) by the messaging client (Klein: col 3, lines 30-33

specify a message storage portion that contains received messages and pending

messages; col 2, lines 3-18 specify storing threaded message conversation, implying it

stores both those received and sent; See also Figure 1, item 159).

Regarding claim 41, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

messaging client is further configured to determine whether the outgoing message is

related to any of the messages received by the messaging client (Klein: Figure 4, item

420; col 11, lines 43-52).

Regarding claim 42, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

messages in the message store include a message comprising a messaging settings

field specifying messaging settings used to control the message characteristics of the

message (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 and pg 20, lines 20-21 specify accessing the

signature header information to determine and control reply message encryption).

Regarding claim 43, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

messaging client is further configured to select the messaging settings specified in the

messaging settings field of the message in the message store to which the outgoing

message is related (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40, pg 20, lines 20-21 specify the header

and controlling of the message; Klein: Figure 1, item 159 depicts the messages can be stored).

Regarding claim 44, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches further comprising a messaging settings store specifying messaging settings used to control the message characteristics of the messages in the store (Ramsdell: pg 8, lines 24-26 specify storing the preference data after analyzing a received message).

Regarding claim 45, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the message store and the messaging settings store are indexed by message identifiers (Klein: Figure 3, item 315 and 325; See also col 8, lines 23-41).

Regarding claim 46, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein

the messaging client is further configured to access the messaging settings store (Ramsdell: pg 8, lines 24-26 specify storing the preference data after analyzing a received message is possible),

and to select the messaging settings specified in the messaging settings store for the message in the message store to which the outgoing message is related (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40).

Regarding claim 47, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the system is implemented in a device selected from the group consisting of: a personal computer

system (recipient computer systems), a handheld electronic device, a wireless mobile communication device, a mobile telephone having data communication functionality, a two-way pager, a voice communication device, a data communication device, and a dual-mode communication device (Klein: Figure 1, item 150 depicts a personal computer; See also col 3, lines 23-38).

Regarding claim 48, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the message characteristics of the messages in the message store comprise secure messaging characteristics selected from the group consisting of: message signing and message encryption (Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 specify the adjusted outgoing message characteristic is encryption and the received message store contains both signature and encryption information).

9.   Claims 9-14, 16-17, 28-32, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); in view of Klein (US 6,496,853 B1), and Baldonado (US 7,035,903 B1); and in further view of Thorne et al (US 5,958,005).

Regarding claim 9, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the received message further comprises messaging settings and wherein the step of selecting settings comprises the step of selecting settings based off the received message settings.

The Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system does not teach wherein the message settings are control flags, nor does he choose selecting a setting based on the control flags.

Thorne, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the received message further comprises messaging settings control flags (Thorne: col 8, lines 27-42 specify that the original message may contain various control flags; See Figure 4 for all flag types); and

wherein the step of selecting comprises the step of selecting messaging settings based on the control flags (Thorne: col 10, lines 35-63 specify that the 'Display Times' indicator of the received message affects the duration of display for the message being composed as a reply as the outgoing message).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thorne for using control flags to indicate setting attributes. The teachings of Thorne, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to quickly identify particular message settings characteristics in a Boolean fashion. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Thorne in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system in order to provide more flexibility with the use of message settings.

Regarding claim 10 the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein

the control flags indicate which of the messaging settings specified in the

messaging settings field (Thorne: col 10, lines 1-25 specify various flags controlling

actions associated with the received email) must be selected for the outgoing message

(Ramsdell: pg 10, lines 28-40 specify when the action is an outgoing message setting,

such as an encryption algorithm).

Regarding claim 11, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein

the message characteristics of the received message (Ramsdell: col 10, lines 28-

40 specify received message characteristics being applied to outgoing messages)

comprise required message characteristics (Thorne: Figure 3, one of items 306, 308,

and 310 must be elected if the outgoing message is specified as being secure); and

the step of selecting comprises the step of confirming that messaging settings

associated with the required message characteristics are selected (Thorne: Figure 3,

item 310 back to item 304 contains a flow path that depicts confirming whether either

item 306, 308, or 310 are selected).

Regarding claim 12, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches further

comprising the step of alerting a user where messaging settings associated with the

required message characteristics are not selected (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 back to

item 304 provides that the user is then prompted to select whether the document should

be secure or not if none of the options are selected; col 7, lines 16-20 specify that the

user may be prompted with a yes/no choice to indicate whether the message is secure).

Regarding claim 13, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the message characteristics of the received message (Ramsdell: col 10, lines 28-40) comprise required message characteristics (Thorne: col 7, lines 1-20 specify that all the control flags are required to be set with either a Yes or No choice by user input or maintaining their default settings; See also Figure 3), further comprising the steps of:

receiving an input from a user of the messaging client (Thorne: col 7, lines 1-20 specify user input; See Figure 3, items 306, 308, 310);

determining whether the input changes any of the required message characteristics (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 into 304 depicts it determining if one has changed);

alerting the user where the input changes any of the required message characteristics (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 into 304 depicts alerting the user when user input does not correctly change required characteristics).

Regarding claim 14, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the input specifies further messaging settings (Thorne: Figure 3, any setting besides 306, 308, or 310) in addition to the messaging settings associated with the required message characteristics, further comprising the steps of:

selecting the further messaging settings in addition to the messaging settings associated with the required message characteristics to control the message

characteristics of the outgoing message (Thorne: Figure 3, items 306-320 depict user

selecting multiple message settings, some required and some not).

Regarding claim 16, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the

received message (Ramsdell: pg 23, lines 21-43 specify the use of headers of a

received message to identify characteristics) comprises control flags indicating the

required message characteristics (Thorne: col 8, lines 28-42 specify flags in the header

for indicating if a secure characteristic flag, i.e. secret, confidential, or restricted, is

required; See also Figure 4).

Regarding claim 17, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the

message characteristics of the received message (Ramsdell: pg 23, lines 21-43 specify

the use of headers of a received message to identify characteristics) further comprise

optional message characteristics (Thorne: col 7, line 66 – col 8, line 12 specify various

optional characteristics of an outgoing message).

Regarding claim 28, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the

step of resolving the conflicting messaging settings (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 into 304

identifies when 'Secure?' has been answered with 'Yes' but no level of security has

been chosen) comprises the steps of:

alerting a user of the messaging client to the conflicting messaging settings (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 into 304 provides the user is re-prompted for the security flag choice, thereby alerting the user);

prompting the user to choose which of the conflicting messaging settings should be selected (Thorne: Figure 3, item 310 into 304 provides prompting the user to re-choose the secure document setting and cycles through items 304 to 310 until the conflict is resolved).

Regarding claim 29, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the received message comprises message restrictions established by a message sender (Thorne: col 10, lines 1-25 specify various restrictions that can be applied to a message being read or composed) where the outgoing message is related to a previously received message (Ramsdell: pg 10, 28-40);

determining whether processing of the outgoing message is allowed by the message restrictions where the received message comprises message restrictions (Thorne, col 10, lines 1-25 specify an do-not-forward specification); and

processing the outgoing message in accordance with the selected messaging settings where processing of the outgoing message is allowed by the message restrictions (Thorne: col 10, lines 1-25 specify that forwarding an email is processed in accordance with the restriction of the received message).

Regarding claim 30, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches a method

further comprising:

contacting the message sender where the received message comprises

message restrictions (Thorne: col 10, lines 51-53 specify that an auto-countdown

expiration restriction can be extended, e.g. temporarily overridden, based off user

input).

Regarding claim 31, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches a method

further comprising:

contacting the message sender to request permission to process the outgoing

message where processing of the outgoing message is not allowed by the message

restrictions (Thorne: col 10, lines 35-53 specify that the notifications such as "Display

Time Exceeded" can be shown to user once the auto-countdown expiration restriction

has expired);

processing the outgoing message in accordance with the selected messaging

settings where a response (user input, such as indicating a reply is to be sent)

comprising permission to process the outgoing message is received from the message

sender (Thorne: col 10, lines 51-54 specify that the user input can temporarily override

this restriction, such as when constructing a reply).

Regarding claim 32, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the

response further comprises an indication of required messaging settings to be used in

the processing of the outgoing message (Thorne: col 10, lines 63-65 specify that after

an indication of reply has been made by the user, e.g. a response, certain messaging

settings are adjusted, such as the portion of the original message being removed from

the reply).

Regarding claim 38, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches a method

further comprising the step of:

selecting default messaging settings to control message characteristics of the

outgoing message where the outgoing message is not related to a previously received

message (Thorne: col 7, lines 1-15 specify that default settings can be used in the

composition of a new message).

10.   Claims 15 and 19-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); in view of Klein (US 6,496,853 B1), Baldonado

(US 7,035,903 B1), and Thorne et al (US 5,958,005); and in further view of Official

Notice.

Regarding claim 15, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches controlling

user input with regard to message characteristics (Thorne: col 8, lines 27-42 provides

for requiring a user to input).

The Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system does not teach wherein controlling consists of ignoring the input where the input changes any of a required characteristic.

An official notice is taken that such use of ignoring user input as a form of controlling user input was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize these known teachings for ignoring user input change to a required setting. These teachings, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to ignore senders changing required encryption settings set by an intended recipient. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize these teachings in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system in order to enforce intended recipient settings.

Regarding claim 19, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system fails to teach wherein message settings consist of alternative message settings that may be used in the stead of default message settings and wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting either the default message setting or the alternative messaging setting.

Thorne, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches the message settings field specifying a default message setting that may be used for outgoing messages (Thorne: col 8, lines 27-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thorne for using control flags to indicate setting attributes and having default control flags. The teachings of Thorne, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to quickly identify particular message settings characteristics, including default settings, in a Boolean fashion. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Thorne in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system in order to provide more flexibility with the use of message settings.

The Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system does not teach wherein message settings consist of alternative message settings that may be used in the stead of default message settings and wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting either the default message setting or the alternative messaging setting.

An official notice is taken that such use of specifying alternative settings and selecting either the default or alternative setting as a method of optimizing the selection of a final setting was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize these known teachings for allowing entry of alternative settings. These teachings, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to choose an alternative setting in place of the default if certain characteristics are noted. One of ordinary skill in the art would

be motivated to utilize these teachings in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system

in order to allow quick customization by enabling users to set alternative settings.

Regarding claim 20, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system does not teach

wherein the messaging settings are specified in order of preference.

An official notice is taken that such use of specifying between settings in an order

of preference as a method of optimizing the selection of a final setting was well known

in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize these known teachings for allowing priority entry of

alternative settings. These teachings, when implemented in the

Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to

choose an alternative setting in a preferential fashion and in place of the default for a

outgoing email. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize these

teachings in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system in order to automatically set

settings in a manner most likeable by the user.

11.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); in view of Klein (US 6,496,853 B1), Baldonado (US

7,035,903 B1), and Thorne et al (US 5,958,005); and in further view of Carpenter et al

(US 5,544,316).

Regarding claim 18, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system teaches wherein the received message (Ramsdell: pg 23, lines 21-43 specify the use of headers of a received message to identify characteristics) comprises control flags indicating the required message characteristics (Thorne: Figure 4 depicts the header information such as the Secure flag and either the secret/confidential/restricted flag; Figure 3, item 310 into 304 depicts the secure flag indicates whether the subsequent secret/confidential/restricted flag is required).

The Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system does not teach having a flag indicate which control flags are optional.

Carpenter, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein user defined attributes are assigned either a 'required' or 'optional' flag (Carpenter: col 43, lines 6-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Carpenter for utilizing optional and required control flags. The teachings of Carpenter, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to quickly identify which message characteristics are either optional or required. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Carpenter in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado/Thorne system in order to enforce certain characteristics upon a user, while allowing others to remain optional.

12.   Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); in view of Klein (US 6,496,853 B1) and Baldonado

(US 7,035,903 B1); and in further view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 49, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system teaches wherein the

message characteristics of the receive message comprise a multitude of typical

message characteristics (Klein: col 9, lines 3-15).

        The Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system does not teach wherein the

characteristics are selected from the group consisting of: message format and message

font.

        An official notice is taken that such use of message format and message font as

user-specifiable message characteristics was well known in the art at the time the

invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize these known teachings for controlling message format and

font. These teachings, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system, will

allow one of ordinary skill in the art to mime message font and format. One of ordinary

skill in the art would be motivated to utilize these known teachings in the

Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system in order to apply the intended recipient controlled

characteristics to commonly adjusted settings.

13.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Ramsdell (RFC 2633, June 1999); in view of Klein (US 6,496,853 B1) and Baldonado
(US 7,035,903 B1); and in further view of Atkins (RFC 1991, August 1996).

Regarding claim 35, the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system does not teach wherein the
message signing and message encryption are signing and encryption according to
PGP.

        Atkins, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the message signing and
message encryption are signing and encryption according to PGP (Atkins: Pg 2, lines
14-22).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to utilize the teachings of Atkins for using PGP. The teachings of
Atkins, when implemented in the Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system, will allow one of
ordinary skill in the art to encrypt or sign messages with yet another standard. One of
ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Atkins in the
Ramsdell/Klein/Baldonado system in order to provide messaging with multiple signing
and encryption capabilities and therefore make it more compatible for communication
with a variety of clients and enable the invention to be reasonably practiced.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

        a.   Knowles et al (US 5,905,863) discloses a system which determines which

emails are conversationally related.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 9:00am - 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Philip C Lee/
Acting Supervisory Patent
Examiner, Art Unit 2442